

Remarks

Claims 1, 3, and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai (US 6,380,998) in view of Kitai et al (US Pub 2002/0163606). Claims 2, 4, 5 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai as modified by Kitai and further in view of Jonsson et al (US 5,746,493). Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai as modified by Kitai and further in view of Sato et al (US 5,351,143).

10 1. Rejection of claims 1, 3, and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1, 3, and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai (US 6,380,998) in view of Kitai et al (US Pub 2002/0163606) for reasons of record, as recited on pages 2-3 of the above-indicated Office action.

15

Response:

Independent claims 1 and 7 of the instant application recite a metallic shield that is directly disposed on the second major face of the translucent plate and electrically connected to the conductive material that is electrically connected to a ground pad. As can be seen in Fig.3 and Fig.5, the metallic shield 36 is directly disposed on the translucent plate 34. The metallic shield 36 is electrically connected to the ground pad 46 through a conductive sponge 44. Therefore, the metallic shield 36 is grounded to the same ground pad 46 as the electronic components 42.

25

Arai, on the other hand, teaches a conductive film 32 disposed on a reflecting plate 31. The "reflecting plate 31 has a reflective function for reflecting the back light and a shield function for shielding the LCD panel 13 against the noise generated by the printed circuit board 34," (col.3, lines 60-64). The conductive film 32 is electrically connected to the ground pattern of the PCB 34. However, the conductive film 32 is not electrically connected to the reflecting plate 31. In col.3, lines 56-60, Arai states that the bezel 37, rear shield 38, TCP

30

shield 36, and the conductive film 32 are all electrically connected to the ground pattern of the PCB 34. However, Arai does not say that the reflecting plate 31 is also electrically connected to the ground pattern of the PCB 34. In fact, Arai does not teach or suggest anywhere in the patent disclosure that the reflecting plate 31 should be electrically connected to the same ground as the electronic components of the PCB 34.

Although the conductive film 32 is electrically connected to the ground pad of the PCB 34, the conductive film 32 is not directly disposed on the light conductive sheet 14, as is required by both of independent claims 1 and 7.

Arai teaches in col.4, lines 20-23 that the conductive film 32 may be adhered onto the rear surface of the reflecting plate 31. However, adhering the conductive film 32 to the reflecting plate 31 does not imply that there is an electrical connection between the conductive film 32 and the reflecting plate 31. This is especially true since Arai never suggests that the reflecting plate 31 should be a metal plate, which might then electrically connect with the conductive film 32.

Kitai teaches that the reflecting layer is a metal layer. However, Kitai also does not teach or suggest that the reflecting layer is electrically connected to ground or that the reflective layer is directly disposed on a translucent light guide plate.

Therefore, neither Arai nor Kitai teach or suggest a metallic shield that is directly disposed on the face of a translucent plate and electrically connected to conductive material that is electrically connected to a ground pad, as is stated in independent claims 1 and 7 of the present invention. Claims 3 and 8-10 are dependent on claims 1 and 7, respectively, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 7 are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 3, and 7-10 is respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of claims 2, 4, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 2, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai as modified by Kitai and further in view of Jonsson et al (US 5,746,493) for reasons of record, as recited on pages 3-4 of the above-indicated Office action.

5

Response:

Claims 2, 4, and 5 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 2, 4, and 5 is respectfully requested.

10 3. Rejection of claims 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai as modified by Kitai and further in view of Sato et al (US 5,351,143) for reasons of record, as recited on page 4 of the above-indicated Office action.

15

Response:

Claims 6 and 11 are dependent on base claims 1 and 7, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 7 are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 6 and 11 is requested.

20

Respectfully submitted,

25 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506
Merrifield, VA 22116
U.S.A.

e-mail: winstonhsu@naipo.com.tw

30 (Please contact me by e-mail if you need a telephone communication and I will return your call promptly.)

Date: 6/18/2004